

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **14 November 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-9, 11-21, 23-33, and 35-37. Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-9, 11, 12, 13, 18-21, 23, 24, 25, 30-33, and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon (USPN 7,043,701 hereinafter “Gordon”), and Miller (USPN 6,597,358 hereinafter “Miller”). Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 14-16 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon, Miller, and DeStefano (USPN 6,874,123 hereinafter “DeStefano”). Examiner rejected claims 5, 17 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon, Miller, and Cook et al. (USPN 6,822,662 B1, hereinafter “Cook”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-9, 11, 12, 13, 18-21, 23, 24, 25, 30-33, and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon and Miller. Applicant respectfully disagrees, because the cube object in Miller is used to display different windows, and the cube object in Miller has a different shape from the 3D window in the present invention.

Specifically, the cube object as disclosed in FIG. 6 in Miller is used to display **different windows for different applications** (see FIG.1, elements 110, FIG. 4, elements 110 and 420, FIG. 6, elements 620, and the associated description in Miller.) These different windows correspond to different applications. Also, each side of the cube object 610 in Miller has approximately the same dimension, and hence is referred as a “cube.”

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention involves displaying the spine of a 3D window that shows the identifying information of the **same window** on the front. (See FIG. 4B and paragraph 63 of the instant application). Note that the title displayed on the spine in the present invention is different from the information displayed on the sides of the cube object in the Miller system,

because each side of the cube in Miller is dedicated to a **different window for a different application**. Moreover, the thickness of the spine in the present invention is significantly less than the dimension of the window displayed on the front side.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 to clarify that the identifying information displayed on the spine of a 3D window is for the same window displayed on the front, and that the thickness of the spine is significantly less than the dimension of the window. These amendments find support in FIG. 4B and paragraph 63 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, 11, 12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-21, 23, 24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, 35, 36 which depend upon claim 35, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao /
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 14 January 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com